

Elmer of Nation editorial

va [US @ is being tested — Do they want a test ban?
Estate / Ans Controller

For the, answer is clear: No. Not now. (Not if
R doesn't.)

Congress?

We, the Peace movement: How much do we want it?

— Is it — as of now — "too small"

— not interesting

— low priority

(see arguments against treating this as a high priority
"Don't just talk: freeze now"
[stop testing] against making a major effort; change's program
against perceiving/describing it as a
"lost cause"

— Presidents: 1958

1963

CASAT movement (SU; US Congress)

IPS ^(Forney) meeting with Sorens, Minneapolis, 1983

{ DE/Kimpton 1982; ^{Sangerman, Delany} Test for life letters 1983; (Brook)
Solomon, 1985

CDI; ...

Dem Platform

Morale Committee

Gasoline Poll

ASAT test: - Has a price - SU testing
- lowers our security "

We need to prevent SU tests

R has no program to do that

We can - by making agreements to forgo ^{both SU and} US tests;
by making US tests contingent on SU

- Congress can do that

- and we will do that; talks

- preventing SU tests our last year

(Tripis
Rothgins)

(We need to prevent X-ray loss)

We need to prevent D-5 MX upward CF → SU LOW crisis

(Will a Midnight conference for

1) D-5's on both sides

2) X-ray losses

3) end of any control:

LTB
CTB
ABM
NPT

Outer Space

(no chance of fringe
or Reduction START)

instability -
incentive to
go first
(with the
second)

19 Aug

DE: France has achieved the SU Moratorium.

Would it have happened, in '85, without last 5 years of France?

Is it significant?

For 22 years, both sides have talked about stopping — without either one ever actually stopping.

Did the back idea or president? In '63, JFK stopped atmospheric testing — and got a PTB in 2 months — and right well have gone further if he & it hadn't been lost.

^{SU} If could have done this any year (with the back in '82 or '83).

SU is gambling on us. Not on R; chance of his picking the up in there is 0. But our impact on Congress... it is not (we are not) what the Schrodinger bill

Our networks and strength are not what they were in 1982; but they (we) exist. Chance of having "our" Pres in WH, this is our greatest opportunity ever... (even though, our chance is not what it would be if media had launched this back recently...)

If media had reported objectively, wouldn't we see this?

Are we up to this? Will we do all we can do — using ingenuity, creativity, ~~more~~ we haven't thought of yet.

as JFK gambled on K.

and of having a bold Congress... and honest media

19 Aug 85

— [To beat same program, we had to beat R's
counter-moves, his pressure

|| "Biggest shortcoming of Fraga is in last 2 weeks —
the SC has given up the Fraga — yet no leadership
in our response

(Solo: "media 'failure' to pick up on our press
conf.

"Need of a leader to go to the press immediately ...

Note: I wanted "quick results," cutting off new CF weapons.
and Fraga was the only hope.

Not because it was easy or highly likely — but that

(a) was not impossible and (b) urgently necessary.

Or (a) ^(~80) — Could have had Center in 81, or ^(~182) Mondra in 84 (if economy ...

|| We now have a chance — even though it ~~was~~ is not

|| what it would have been if media had properly reported it —
a chance far higher than could have been foreseen any time in the last
year — or since R embarked his strategy of winning on MX

1963 — What would have happened — CTB? — if JFK had lived?

(Could he have brought it off? Would he have been

'allowed' to?

And see PTB as "counter-move" equivalent

to R's shift in rhetoric to "negotiations for reductions."

Basis for new priority:

— Prospects for more aditious aid, chilled
since now, spring

— ~~Prospects~~ ^{Prospects} SU more focusing on this:
willing to join, rather than initiate

(Or is it: ^{Congress} "US won't initiate." — won't trust SU to follow

^{Congress} "US won't respond to SU initiative:

SU propaganda

SU advantage

[USG won't admit we
(If US initiates, it shows US weakness. are ahead, or strong)

If SU initiates, it shows SU is ahead, has advantage, US is weak.

(I wouldn't have favored "narrowing" our
goals to this, before Aug 30, 1985;

say — now, less prospects for broader goals would have
seemed hardly less promising than for this;

but now, given SU momentum, prospects for this (still
low) are much higher than for anything else

(SU has finally helped out on something);

and if we lose this, ^{by Jan 86} prospects for this or anything else
in the next few years will be, and be, nil.

One Moratorium:

"DE should write:

- draft her for people to take down to groups
- memo for Kownacki to give bishops.
(see Micke, who is about to address Pax Christi)
- Ed for Nation [3 pages?
- Op Ed for LAT (see Drogien)
(NYT?
Wash Post?

- [

the view of significance
[misrepresentation of media is worst & can remember
- for non-classified event (unlike, say, Israeli Gulf,
not involving New secretary
~~classified~~

shows how much WH could shape the perception
& description of a non-US event (SU action).

[Pleasant note lacks PR. But look at SU!] (Mic)

(Or — should we conclude that a Congressional strategy was hopeless, ^{over} since R's landslide

(Can "Frage" be a inspiring long-term aim?

Wasn't its appeal premised on fairly quick success?

(Should have been formulated as Marathon or
as need for negot
testing & deployment — not on Congress

("We should have supported Jackson — from agenda.")

— Must we conclude now that we have always needed/needed
"at least some minimum" of media "help" —

and "authorities" (retired experts; Congressional
leaders)

(Yet we had and have no media expertise
or ~~understand~~ strategy or management).

(Or Work. Lobby

[No one has mentioned.]
either

I'd have registered "College"
as if we had alternatives.

("News of an attack is news — as long as the spell
on news is not. (But the spelled by name DUE!)

Kathy Honey
202-225-4431 Pat Schneider

Propaganda: SU "spent" — no need for tests over next 5 months.

⁷ (lowest number of tests ^{for either side} over the last 20 years: ^{only} ~~1/2~~ in the last 7 years, 3 to 4 times as many.

US has ^{done} ~~largest~~ twice as many in each of the last 6 six years.

SU broke last moratorium

False: moratorium ended, either in Dec '59

or with French Testing in 1960-61

(^{dates, no moratorium} absence of testing does not constitute

"moratorium"; it is meant to say

"moratorium lasted 3 years"

Senate (last year) in favor of indefinite suspension of CTB (US. WP, ed — "is CTB ~~back~~ — after 25 years — as a test subject?")

Seaborg, realist (+ Dan Chamberlain...)

Re Aug 6 (LAT): US would join moratorium (how long? when?) after test for Midgyton — not before the end of the year at earliest



SU As, in effect, given the US "five tests" still (for -
so they say as well as observers
(though Gov. did say, he "expects" pos. response
by US - asks US to join...
but while March '58, does not ask immediate
joining for SU monoton to ally.)

Like the, Aug '58 (to ally 1 year from Oct '58)
except, open-ended after that!

Unlike JFK, Jan 19 (like K, March 58): open-ended,
but conditional on SU proving refraining
immediately.

(do - the one is new)

R admits, refusal to join monoton is: need to test
new signals

(see my letter to Division!)
(not, verification)

I read: front page of NYT, Tues 31 July
" ^{+ insert} of LAT " "
Wash Post " "

Press Conf Monday 5 Aug (~ 6 Aug)
Wash Post - 6 Aug

R position: CTB is deliverer / receiver long-term goal
(but not now —
not after else, now !)

First:

- Organize massive letters to editors, esp. in local areas of key Congresspersons.
- [Call-in to talk shows
- [Expose
- Form task force - budget - plans
CDI - Frege - SAVE - keep peace -

Test Ban

Frage Campaign

1. Keeping up pressure at NTS

Catholic bishops

"media blackout from 6-9" CNO-

2. CTB Res 3 Knoch-Bedell (with 3 votes)
(over 200 co-sponsors)

3. Shroeder

DOE already already in Conference

Would need leadership sponsorship to get
substance of bill onto agenda.

4. Vigils during summit - introduction - during the
summit - on issue of test ban.

5. Summit Sabbath - religious visibility.

Petition